The JPO was closed in 2002 on completion of the field investigations except some confirmatory geo-physical tests required on the Nepal bank at Rupaligad (alternative) site for re-regulating structure.

Some contentious issues, I ike (i) apportionment of cost between power and irrigation and between India and Nepal; (ii) installation capacity and unit size and assessment of power benefits; and (iii) water availability downstream of Pancheshwar, etc. are also pending for final decision with Government of Nepal. No discussions could be held with Nepal since December, 2004 due to internal situation in Nepal.

Low level of ground water

† 4288. SHRI PYARELAL KHANDELWAL: Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that number of such districts where ground water has reached at a dangerously low level is increasing in the country;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) if not, the details of the related schemes and their achievements, State-wise;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the ground water situation is very bad in the national capital; and

(e) if so, the details of the efforts being made by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI JAI PRAKASH NARAYAN YADAV): (a) to (c) As per the assessment of ground water resources carried out by Central Ground Water Board (CGWB), 839 units (Blocks/ Mandals/Talukas) have been categorized as 'Over-exploited', 226 units as 'Critical' and 550 as 'Semi-crrtical'.

(d) and (e) As per report of CGWB, seven out of nine districts of NCT Delhi are over-exploited. The measures taken for management and development of ground water resources in NCT Delhi include the following:—

> Notification of South and South-West districts of NCT Delhi by Central Ground Water Authority (CGWA) for regulation of ground water development and management. Digging of new groundwater abstraction structures in these areas without prior permission of CGWA, is prohibited.

> Implementation of demonstrative rain water harvesting and artificial recharge projects during Ninth Plan in various parts of the city.

> Organization of Mass Awareness and Water Management Training Programmes.

Development of tubewells/exploratory wells.

Recommendation of Second ARC about control over rivers and groundwater

4289. SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA:
SHRIMATI SHOBHANABHARTIA:

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(a) whether the second Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) has urged framing a radical National Law to centralise control over river and groundwater in prder to address emerging conflicts;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the Inter-State water disputes amongst States are increasing and the Central Government efforts to resolve the disputes are not fruitful; and

(d) if so, the reaction of the Central Government on the views of the Second ARC?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI JAI PRAKASH NARAYAN YADAV): (a) to (d) In chapter 5 of its Seventh Report, containing water related issues, the Second Administrative Reforms Commission does not mention any specific suggestion about "framing of radical national law to centralize control over river and groundwater in order to address the emerging conflicts".

The mechanism for settlement of water dispute is already available in the form of Inter State River Water Disputes (ISRWD) Act, 1956. The ISRWD Act, 1956 has been amended in the year 2002 whereby the adjudication of the water dispute by the tribunal has been made time-bound. As per the ISRWD Act, 1956, the water dispute arises among two or more State Governments when the Central Government receives request under Section 3 of the Act from any of the basin States with regard to existence of water dispute. In accordance with the said Act, the Central Government is required tc cfer a dispute to a Tribunal after it is satisfied that the dispute cannot be settled by negotiations.

At present there are five water disputes which have been referred under ISRWD Act, 1956 namely, Ravi & Beas, Cauvery, Krishna, Mahadayi and Vansadhara river water dispute.

The water disputes related to Cauvery and Krishna were referred to the Tribunals for adjudication in 1990 and 2004 respectively. The Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal (CWDT) submitted report and decision under section 5(2) of the ISRWD Act. 1956 on 5.2.2007. Party States and Central Government have sought guidance/clarification from the tribunal under section 5(3) of the Act. Further, party State have also filed Special Leave Petition (SLP) in Hon'ble Supreme Court against the report and decision of the tribunal as mentioned above. The Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal passed orders on Interim Relief Applications of the States on 9.6.2006.

The water dispute related to Ravi & Beas was referred to the Ravi & Beas Waters Tribunal (RBWT) in 1986 under Section 14 of the said Act. RBWT submitted its report on 30.1.1987 under section 5(2) of the Act. Party States and Central Government have sought explanation/ guidance under section 5(3) of the Act from the Tribunal. The Tribunai has not submitted its further report to the Government.

In respect of Mahadayi River Water Dispute raised by Government of Goa, the Ministry of Water Resources is of the opinion that water dispute contained in the request of Government of Goa cannot be settled by negotiation. Meanwhile, the Government of Goa filed a suit in the Supreme Court for setting up of Water Dispute Tribunal for adjudication, of Mahadayi River Water Dispute and an Interlocutory Application (IA) for stay in construction activity in September 2006.

In respect of Vansadhara Water Dispute, the Central Government has not concluded so far that the dispute cannot be settled by negotiations. Meanwhile, the Government of Orissa has filed a Writ Petition in September, 2006 in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.